

Yet even now, some ask: Why didn't they just give up? When the biological father first pressed his case, why didn't the "Does" simply hand the child over and spare him and themselves a greatly amplified agony four years later?

For the answer, consider the story of two New Yorkers, Cameron and Brandon Baldanza—a local Baby Richard case with a vastly different ending.

Cameron, born in September 1989, and Brandon, born a year later, were abandoned at the hospital by their biological mother, Magaly Galindo. To be sure, Galindo did leave the boys something to remember her by—an addiction to the heroin she pumped into her system throughout the two pregnancies.

Fortunately, there was someone unwilling to walk away from Cameron and Brandon: Millie Baldanza, a first cousin to Galindo, who took the boys into her home and into her heart, knowing in advance they entered the world as junkies.

With her husband, Jimmie, Millie nursed the two kids through a nightmare no parent would want to imagine, let alone experience—the body-quaking ordeal of drug withdrawal. Brandon and Cameron survived—and thrived.

Meanwhile, Galindo and the boys' birth father, Jose Diaz, were working as hard at being strangers as the Baldanzas were at being parents. They had virtually no contact with the boys for two years, making their very first appearance in court six months after the Child Welfare Administration began proceedings to terminate their parental rights.

Millie and Jimmie could have given up then. It would have been hard to blame them, given Child Welfare's blatant bias for "family preservation"—social-workerese for the philosophy that nothing is worse for a child than adoption. Or they might have tossed in the towel last summer, when Brandon and Cameron were forced into extended stays with their now-you-see-them, now-you-don't birth parents.

But Millie and Jimmie did not give up. And early last month, less than a week after the taking of Baby Richard, Judge Marjory Fields of the Bronx Family Court ordered the return of Brandon and Cameron to the Baldanzas at the end of this month—a delay only so they can finish the school term.

Fields based her decision on testimony from expert witnesses who concluded "the children have suffered grievous harm from being removed from the [Baldanzas'] care."

The experts backed up that grim diagnosis with tales of caseworkers forcing the screaming children into taxis for visits with Diaz and Galindo, of Cameron cowering in his closet and complaining of chest pains and headaches when the visits were increased.

The prognosis for the boys if they were taken from the Baldanzas: "personality disorder, clinical depression"—perhaps even suicide.

That would have been the fate of Cameron and Brandon had Millie and Jimmie decided to let their kids be abandoned for a second time. And tragically, it may well be what lies ahead for Baby Richard.

But win or lose, there is an even simpler reason why adoptive families are willing to fight from the very first to the very last for their kids.

Because that is what they are: our kids. Not some stereo equipment we're ready to return if it doesn't work out. Not a sports car we are borrowing for a test drive. Our kids. The second they cross our door, we have made a commitment for life, more serious than most marriages—and as sacred as birth.

Thanks to the Baldanzas and the Does for declaring it to the world: They are our kids.

•

TRIBUTE TO KING RAMA IX OF THAILAND

• Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, today, King Bhumibol Adulyadej of Thailand begins the 50th year of his reign. It is my great pleasure to join Montana's Thai community in offering him congratulations and best wishes.

THE NINTH REIGN

King Bhumibol took the name Rama IX and opened the Ninth Reign of the Chakri Dynasty on June 9, 1946, just a few months after the end of the Second World War.

At the time, like the rest of Southeast Asia, Thailand faced severe questions. They arose from the end of colonialism in neighboring countries; the rise of radical ideologies worldwide; and endemic poverty, illiteracy and illness.

Today, Thailand is one of the anchors of the modern, prosperous Southeast Asia. Bangkok has become one of the world's great cities and commercial centers. The Thai political system is evolving into a stable parliamentary democracy; in fact, a new political campaign opens today as candidates across Thailand file their papers to run for Parliament. And the Thai economy grows by 7 percent or more every year.

Much of this extraordinary success is due to the wise guidance of King Bhumibol.

The King has led by example. He has embodied the 10 traditional moral principles of Buddhist Kings: charity toward the poor; morality, sacrifice of personal interest; honesty; courtesy; self-restraint; tranquility of temperament; non-violence; patience; and impartiality in settling dispute.

And he has led by action. Together, King Bhumibol and Queen Sirikit have devoted decades to improving the lives of Thai people in rural and impoverished regions. They constantly travel the country's 73 provinces, meeting with villagers and staying close to the people. The results are obvious in improved public health, the spread of education to all Thai children and the renewal of traditional crafts and textiles.

KING RAMA IX AND THE UNITED STATES

King Bhumibol has also been a great friend of the United States. During his reign, the Thai-American relationship has grown from one largely based on American aid and political support, into a partnership for trade, prosperity, environmental protection and regional peace. And Thailand is about to fulfill the pledge he made in his 1967 Address to a joint session of Congress: to end reliance on American foreign aid.

The new maturity of Thai-American relations can be seen in our prospects for trade. American exports to Thailand more than tripled in the last 7 years. They grew to nearly \$5 billion last year, and now support nearly 100,000 jobs in America.

Prospects are especially good for my State of Montana. Our farmers and ranchers can supply a generation of newly affluent Thai consumers with top-quality wheat, beef, and pork.

Montana environmental technology companies—in areas from mine waste reclamation to clean coal technology, sustainable forestry and low-impact agricultural fertilizer—can help Thailand address its fast-growing environmental problems. Firms like Mountain States Energy in Butte are already looking to the Kingdom for opportunity.

And people-to-people contracts between Thailand and Montana are growing fast. Thais like former Ambassador Birabhongse Kasemsri are helping to support the Montana economy, by coming as tourists to see our National Parks and visit our skiing areas. And in several cities, some of the newest members of the Montana family operate well-run small businesses like the Thai Deli in Missoula and the Thai Orchid Restaurant in Billings. They work hard, provide jobs and add a new touch of diversity to our State.

CONCLUSION

Mr. President, King Bhumibol is now the longest-reigning King of Thailand. And history is certain to rank his reign with those not only of the greatest Thai monarchs of the past—Ramkhamhaeng, creator of the Thai alphabet; Naresuan and Phra Narai in the Ayutthaya era; Mongkut and Chulalongkorn in the last century—but the great constitutional monarchs of the world and the democratic leaders of modern times.

It is my great pleasure to join all the Thai Montanans in congratulating King Bhumibol as he begins the 50th year of his reign, and looking forward to many more to come. •

TAKE THE LEAD, MR. CLINTON

• Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, recently, Matthew Miller, a former senior adviser to the Office of Management and Budget, had an op-ed piece about the budget.

It says precisely what I believe: that the Administration should have provided Congress with a better budget, that the Republicans should be applauded for trying to achieve a balanced budget by the year 2002, but that the priorities in the Republican budget are all wrong, even though the goal is a proper one.

I know the budget has already passed the Senate and the House, and we will be facing it shortly in conference, but in the belief that telling the truth always has some virtue, I ask that the Matthew Miller piece be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, May 16, 1995]

TAKE THE LEAD, MR. CLINTON
(By Matthew Miller)

WASHINGTON.—I left the Clinton Administration in January when the White House issued a budget that I felt turned away from

its previous commitment to deficit reduction and sensible public investment.

Today, while supporting President Clinton in opposing the cruel and counterproductive Republican budget resolutions in the House and Senate, I also wonder why the White House has let the Republicans seize this issue.

Though the Administration is right to criticize plans that would cut spending for the most vulnerable Americans to help finance tax breaks for the well-off, it will not rally much support by hypocritically attacking cutbacks in Medicare and Medicaid or by resisting the idea of balancing the budget altogether.

Last week, the White House chief of staff, Leon Panetta, said that the Republicans would "make Medicare a second-class health care system for our seniors." The Administration's 1993 economic plan, "A Vision of Change for America," struck a different note. In it, the Administration hoped to "control the growth of Medicare and Medicaid spending in the long term, and thereby supplement the deficit reduction in this economic program."

Assuming "health care controls," the plan estimated that the deficit would decline to \$87 billion in the year 2003—from what otherwise would have been \$399 billion. Bringing down the combined annual growth rate of Medicare and Medicaid was the single most important factor in the reduction.

This slower growth would have meant saving about \$66 billion yearly on average over a 10-year period. The Republican Senate budget resolution, by contrast, calls for savings that average \$65 billion yearly over seven years, while the House resolution calls for \$69 billion yearly over the same period.

It's hard to understand how a goal the Administration considered reasonable only two years ago can seem unthinkable draconian today.

Nor is the Republicans' aim of balancing the budget by 2002 as dangerous for the economy as the Administration suggests. Mainstream economists generally agree that reducing the deficit by the equivalent of 0.5 percent of the gross domestic product per year can be reliably offset by the Federal Reserve (for example, by lowering interest rates). With the Congressional Budget Office forecasting the deficit at 2.5 percent of the gross domestic product in 1995, that would mean a five-year path to a balanced budget by 2000 would be reasonable.

In any event, it would be far better policy and better politics for Mr. Clinton to take the lead by offering his own plan to balance the budget rather than merely sniping at the Republicans.

The GOP resolutions would slash basic research, investment in infrastructure and in education, while leaving untouched most of the welfare for the well-off that permeates the budget. While families struggling on \$35,000 a year would continue to bear a disproportionate tax burden, for example, \$30 billion in health and pension benefits would still go every year to senior citizens who have incomes above \$100,000—giving these retirees far more back than they paid into the system.

Yet all of the Administration's well-taken criticisms will be ignored if President Clinton does not renew his commitment to addressing the problem of the deficit. The Republicans' methods may be misguided, but the goal they have embraced is the right one. Mr. Clinton should waste no time in taking back an issue he claimed as his own from his first days in office.●

THE 23RD ANNUAL JEWISH HERITAGE FESTIVAL

● Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, our country is a remarkable mosaic—a mixture of races, languages, ethnicities, and religions—that grows increasingly diverse with each passing year. Nowhere is this incredible diversity more evident than in the State of New Jersey. In New Jersey, schoolchildren come from families that speak 120 different languages at home. These different languages are used in over 1.4 million homes in my State. I have always believed that one of the United States' greatest strengths is the diversity of the people that make up its citizenry and I am proud to call the attention of my colleagues to an event in New Jersey that celebrates the importance of the diversity that is a part of America's collective heritage.

On June 4, 1995 the Garden State Arts Center in Holmdel, NJ began its 1995 Spring Heritage Festival Series. This heritage festival program salutes many of the different ethnic communities that contribute so greatly to New Jersey's diverse makeup. Highlighting old country customs and culture, the festival programs are an opportunity to express pride in the ethnic backgrounds that are a part of our collective heritage. Additionally, the spring heritage festivals will contribute proceeds from their problems to the Garden State Arts Center's Cultural Center Fund which presents theater productions free-of-charge to New Jersey's schoolchildren, seniors, and other deserving residents. The heritage festival thus not only pays tribute to the cultural influences from our past, it also makes a significant contribution to our present day cultural activities.

On Sunday, June 11, 1995, the Heritage Festival Series will celebrate the 23d Annual Jewish Festival of the Arts. Co-chaired by Amy Schwartz of Springfield, NJ and Martin Hacker of Metuchen, NJ, this year's event promises to be a grand show featuring many talented entertainers including: the Golden Land Klezmer Orchestra, singer Mike Burstyn, and comedian Freddie Roman.

On behalf of all Jewish New Jerseyans, I offer my congratulations on the occasion of the 23d Annual Jewish Festival of the Arts.●

EXPLANATION OF SELECTED VOTES TO THE SENATE BUDGET RESOLUTION

● Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, just prior to the Memorial Day recess, the Senate considered a near-record number of amendments to the Senate budget resolution. Since many of these amendments were offered after time had expired and voted upon without debate, I want to take some time now to offer explanations for several of the more critical votes about which I was unable to comment at the time.

During the budget markup in committee the focus of many amendments

was the so-called fiscal dividend reserve fund. This fund was established to incorporate the estimates of the Congressional Budget Office regarding the benefits of balancing the budget. According to the CBO, if Congress successfully balances the budget over the next 7 years, we will experience lower interest rates and lower costs to the Government—about \$170 billion over the next 7 years. It was the position of the chairman—a position I strongly support—that any fiscal dividend resulting from balancing the budget should be given back to the taxpayers in the form of tax cuts.

One amendment offered on the Senate floor was the Feingold amendment to strike the budget surplus from the resolution. Instead of using the surplus for more spending—as previous amendments had—this amendment would have killed it outright, striking at the heart of efforts in the Senate to provide tax relief for American families. I opposed it for that reason. Over the next 7 years, the Federal Government will spend approximately \$12 trillion. Much of this spending will take the form of transfer payments from those people who are working and paying taxes to those less fortunate. I believe it is important for a compassionate country to take care of the elderly and the poor, and I support many of these programs. However, I also support those families who are not receiving Federal assistance but rather are working hard and paying taxes. The fiscal dividend is about 1½ percent of total Government spending over the next 7 years. In my mind, this tiny surplus belongs to the taxpayers who make all the other Government programs possible.

One amendment I did support was the Hatfield amendment to restore \$7 billion in spending reductions to the National Institutes of Health by cutting all other discretionary accounts across-the-board. As Senator HATFIELD made clear during the debate, the United States is suffering from epidemics of cancer, Alzheimer's, and AIDS. The research conducted by the NIH is instrumental in fighting these diseases, and it is important that their efforts be fully funded.

Another amendment I supported was the McConnell amendment to restore funding for the Appalachian Regional Commission. Under the Senate budget, all funding for ARC would have been eliminated over 5 years. Rather than eliminate the entire program, this amendment will reduce the program's funding by 35 percent in 1996 and 47 percent overall. I believe it strikes a careful balance between cutting spending and hurting economic development in specific regions of the country. In recent weeks, I have been working on a task force to determine the efficacy of Federal agencies. Should that effort conclude that the Appalachian Regional Commission is duplicative, wasteful, or has attained its objectives,